





United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/451,506	11/30/1999	GRAHAM W. GLASS	073388.0120 9157		
759	90 02/25/2004		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
BAKER & BOTTS LLP			MIRZA, ADNAN M		
2001 ROSS AV DALLAS, TX			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			2141	11	
			DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ALG
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	,
Advisory Action	09/451,506	GLASS, GRAHAM W	•
·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Adnan M Mirza	2141	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addre	9SS
THE REPLY FILED 11 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applicati	to a ion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a). The feet have been filed in the period of t	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appro originally set in the final C	priate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b)□ disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
10. ☐ Other:			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose a client system a class with a type code and a communication protocol without generating a stub or skeleton as provided by independent claims 1 and 12. As to applicant's argument McQuistan disclosed the interpreted RPC of the present invention is described below relative to embodiments will be apparent to one skilled in the art. The preferred Embodiment performs interpreted RPC, without the use of stubs on the server side. Therefore no code or data is duplicated on the server side, thereby saving significant amounts of storage. (col. 5, lines 16-21). The Fig. 1 of Mcquistan clearly disclosed the two embodiments the one with the stub and the other without the stub.

V RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER